

STATINTL

16 June 1969

JMM:

STATINTL

1. This date discussed with [REDACTED] the DDP's comments concerning the Yarborough bill (S. 764).

2. Valtin agreed with our position and said he would report our conversation at the DDP staff meeting tomorrow, indicating that in general section 4 does not pose a problem but if it did there was little that could be done without gutting the bill.

STATINTL

3. I told [REDACTED] we didn't intend to do anything with the bill now, but if it becomes active we would push for revision of section 7 and at that time would also review with the subcommittee section 4 to assure that it is in ^{on}consance with our views as spelled out in the attached 9 June 1969 Memorandum for the Record.

STATINTL

LLM

STATINTL

11 June 1969

JMM:

1. Following Senator Dominick's visit to Headquarters on 7 May we asked the Deputy Directors and General Counsel to review the "new" Yarborough bill (International Activities Foundation) so that you could advise the Senator if we had any further views other than our interest in permitting beneficiaries to volunteer national security information.

2. The DDP's paper raises the point that the bill also would prohibit using the Foundation's mechanism for supporting the Agency's "covert action" interests. I can't comprehend the DDP's raising this as an objection in view of the bill's purpose. Attached memorandum deals with the DDP's position in greater detail.

3. Courses of action.

STATINTL

a. Find out what DDP really has on its mind, preferably through [REDACTED] which presumably prepared the DDP paper.

b. Unless the bill becomes active or unless DDP can sustain its point with us, I see no merit in your meeting with Senator Dominick to repeat what you said to him on 7 May. Of course, the bill is always a convenient device to initiate discussions with him on other points of interest.

STATINTL

LLM

ILLEGIB